

REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the June 16, 2008 Office action and have amended the application to more clearly set forth aspects of the invention. This Amendment B amends claims 14 and 22. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 2, 5-14, 17, 20-22, 25, 27-36 and 39 are presented in the application for further examination. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Drawings

Applicants request that the Examiner now have the drawings as originally filed reviewed and accepted.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 5-14, 17, 20-22, 25, 27-36 and 39 stand rejected as anticipated by Bryan (US 7,133,869). Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection on the basis that the amended claims recite a combination of elements not taught by Bryan or the other references, either separately or taken together.

Bryan teaches methods and systems for defining and distributing information alerts include presenting a user with a series of templates that allows the user to define security events. (Abstract). Intended recipients for the alerts are presented with templates that allow the individuals to input contact and schedule information for receiving the information alerts. (Abstract). A knowledge switch uses the event definitions and the contact and schedule information to detect events and distribute the information alerts to the intended recipients when an event occurs. (Abstract). The information alerts include directives that instruct intended recipients regarding action to be taken in response to a security event. (Abstract).

However, (1) Bryan does not disclose executing the notifications application on a recurring basis to generate a notification ... wherein the notification is generated based on matching the latest recurring event of the specified category with subscribers of the specified category and (2) Bryan does not disclose a template specifying a predefined schedule time for notifications to occur.

First, with respect to **latest recurring event**, the Examiner asserts that FIG. 9; column 4, lines 65-67; column 5, lines 1-9; and column 10, lines 14-34 of Bryan teaches the notification is generated **based on matching the latest recurring event** of the specified category with subscribers of the specified category. Applicants disagree, **Bryan teaches generating a notification when an event or series of events occur**. (Column 5, lines 6-7). And, FIG. 9 and column 10, lines 14-34 merely discloses that users are allowed to "associate schedule information with contact profiles." (Column 10, lines 14-16). Bryan teaches that **contacts may input a schedule** so the notification is sent to the proper device depending on the date/time. (Column 10, lines 14-32; FIG. 9). For example, a contact may specify home and work hours and list different phone numbers. (Column 10, lines 6-13; FIG. 8). However, Bryan does not teach **the notification is generated based on matching the latest recurring event of the specified category with subscribers of the specified category**.

In contrast, claim 1 recites:

enabling a notifications application based on the received template, said notifications application **mapping the latest recurring event of the specified category to one or more subscribers as a function of the parameters specified by the content provider**; and

executing the notifications application on a recurring basis to generate a notification in accordance with the predefined scheduled time specified by the received parameter-driven template parameters, **wherein the notification is generated based on matching the latest recurring event of the specified category with subscribers of the specified category**, and wherein the generated notification is delivered to the subscribers of the specified category on a recurring basis in accordance with the predefined scheduled time defined by the received parameter-driven template parameters.

For example, a scenario template provides subscriptions to be defined in terms of subscribing to a specific category (or channel) of notifications to be delivered at a predetermined time of day. (Specification, [0039]). In this instance, event feeds including the full "alert" to be sent are expected to come in for each category or channel on a recurring basis. (Specification, [0039]). Notifications are generated **based on matching the latest event of a given category with the subscriptions for the same category at the predefined schedule time**. (Specification, [0039]).

Second, with respect to a predefined schedule for notifications, the Examiner asserts that that column 5, lines 59-67; and column 10, lines 14-34 of Bryan teaches a **disclose a template specifying a predefined schedule time for notifications to occur**. Applicants disagree, Bryan

teaches that **contacts may input a schedule** so the notification is sent to the proper device depending on the date/time. (Column 10, lines 14-32; FIG. 9). For example, a contact may specify home and work hours and list different phone numbers. (Column 10, lines 14-32; FIG. 9). However, Bryan does not teach a predefined recurring schedule of notifications for a category of events.

As explained above, Bryan does not teach **the notification being generated based on matching the latest recurring event of the specified category with subscribers of the specified category and a template specifying a predefined schedule time for notifications to occur** as recited in claim 1. Thus, claim 1 recites elements not found in Bryan and the rejection of the claims based on §102 should be withdrawn. Claims 14, 22, and 36 include similar subject matter as claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 2, 5-13, 17, 20, 21, 25, 27-35 and 39 depend from claims 1, 14, 22, and 36, respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reason as claims 1, 14, 22, and 36.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that the claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein. Applicants thus respectfully submit that claims as presented are in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited aspects of the invention. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/Barbara A. Wilkey/

Barbara A. Wilkey, Reg. No. 62,986
SENNIGER POWERS LLP
100 North Broadway, 17th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 345-7000